

3-25-10 Core Group Agenda

Meeting Details

- Date and Time: March 25, 3-5:00
- Location: Glacier Bank of Whitefish

Monday, March 22, 2010
8:29 PM

Agenda

Time	Item	
3:00	Call to Order, Approval of Agenda	
3:05	Approval of Minutes from 3-11-2010 meeting	See attached
3:15	Confirm Core Group designates, elect chair and vice chair	
3:25	Review Scope of Work and Timeline from Conservation Partners	Provide as soon as possible
4:30	Brainstorm how one or two uses might work	
4:45	Agenda for Next Meeting	
5:00	Adjournment	

Core Group Meeting Minutes

March 11, 2010

Glacier Bank

Core Group attendees: Mike Collins, Steve Lorch, Karl Cozad, Nancy Woodruff, Fred Jones

Visitors: Mike Jopek, Marshall Friedman, Diane Conradi (coordinator), Bob Sandman, Brian Manning, Lin Akey, Mike Gwiazdon

Overview of Marty's approach

1. Review Plan to see what's working and what's not.
2. Pick two subareas in the plan that have a number of qualities—motivated parties, funding opps, “do-ability and visibility” These places should get the project down the road.
3. Identify organizational needs—all of the elements that need to be in place in order to do transactions.
 - FGP/Fund
 - DNRC process
4. Develop strategies
 - Trail/recreation planning
 - ID partners—users, funding and management
 - Sustainable management—timber and comp
 - Mitigation services like wildlife or wetland mitigation
5. Meet with key constituencies
 - Meet with Core Group
 - Meet with constituent groups—schedule meetings
 - Come back to the Core Group with recommendations
 - Refine strategies, provide recommendations to Core Group
 - Public meeting

Brian noted that MEPA will be required on projects, but not necessarily on the plan itself.

Marty discussed Castle Valley. Castle Valley had 12 subareas that were sold/managed in accordance with a transaction structure. The largest conservation transaction was an exchange with the Forest Service for about 8000 acres. Questions about the revenue, economic analysis, revenue from other uses. Had a transaction plan that privatized parcels (conservation buyer), USFS land exchange.

Discussed Marty's services, what he brings to the table.

Group agreed to accept a SOW and then pick and choose which services he can provide.

MEPA and Process Discussion

MEPA discussion—when MEPA is required and what level. Four choices:

No MEPA

Local authorization

Programmatic MEPA

Project level MEPA

There are ways to identify the scope of the project that will allow MEPA to proceed. Can tier to programmatic. Will continue to discuss ways to make the MEPA process efficient and effective to accomplish RRC goals.

- Next meeting, group decided to identify some uses to see how they would pencil out in MEPA.
- Next meeting, review SOW and discuss at next meeting.

Important things for Core Group to do for DNRC:

Need backing of beneficiaries when go to Land Board.

Process and procedure for bringing Helena up to speed—monthly conference call with staff in Helena.

Communication structures for decision making entities. May want to have periodic briefings for the City Council and other entities.

CASTLE VALLEY PLANNING PROCESS

Conserving Trust Land in a Distinctive Landscape

The small, rural community of Castle Valley is located in the beautiful red rock desert of southeastern Utah surrounded by 4,500 acres of trust lands. Many of the town's 350 residents describe themselves as "urban runaways" or "renegades" escaping the city for the harsh beauty of Utah's southeastern desert landscape.

In 1998, Utah's School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) decided to auction land at the base of Parriott Mesa, one of the prominent red rock geological features in Castle Valley. Previously unaware of the differences between trust lands and other types of state or federal land in the Valley, many community members realized that the loss of this natural open space was a possibility.

A group of concerned residents formed the Castle Rock Collaboration (CRC) to represent the conservation interests of the town. SITLA, CRC and the town government engaged in a multi-year process to plan for appropriate development and potentially allow for conservation options on the trust lands.

"A big part of the collaborative process was the relationship building that allowed [the community] to do business with SITLA. Through this relationship building, we hoped that we could have our ultimate conservation goal and also honor SITLA's mandate, which is to raise money for the school trust, so that it could be a win-win situation for everyone."

Laura Kamala, Director of Utah Programs, Grand Canyon Trust

establishing shared goals and experiences and engaging in joint fact-finding. Group activities — hikes and celebrations of successes — kept many motivated. As participant Wendy Fisher explained, "You've got to focus on the quality of the experiences that everybody has ... celebrate little milestones, little successes."

Because of the planning process, SITLA sold more than 700 acres of trust land for conservation purposes, achieving both revenue generation and protection of land valued for its natural resources, scenic beauty and wildlife habitat. A land exchange is currently pending with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for the remainder of the lands owned by SITLA in the Valley. If the land exchange is approved, the BLM will manage the land in Castle Valley for its conservation value.

The collaborative group experienced some challenges including achieving mixed success with community outreach, misunderstanding the role of the town in the collaborative process and perceiving mutually exclusive objectives — SITLA's goal was to generate revenue through development and the community's goal was to maintain open space and prevent development. However, there were a number of elements that facilitated successful interactions including creating partnerships,

Case Study 1

Location: Southeast Utah

Trust Lands Acreage: 4,500 acres

Collaborative Group: >15 participants

Interests Represented: Castle Valley community members and town officials, Utah SITLA

Duration: 4+ years

End Product: Land exchange proposal with the BLM



What Helped the Process?

- ▶ Partnering with other organizations helped CRC raise money for conservation purchases
- ▶ Shared experiences and joint fact-finding helped build positive relationships and ensure the legitimacy of information

What Was Challenging?

- ▶ Perception of mutually exclusive objectives slowed progress
- ▶ Lack of ways to communicate with the community impeded public education and outreach
- ▶ Difficulty clarifying participant roles caused miscommunication, particularly between CRC and the town government